

REMARKS

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 1

Claim 1 stands rejected as being allegedly rendered obvious by the combination of *Greer* and *D'Arbeloff*.

***Greer* fails to disclose “receiving...information indicating that...physical products have been pre-paid” and “receiving...information indicating that a payment specific to...pre-paid physical products has been made.”**

All information placed on *Greer*'s smart card is listed in detail in connection with FIG. 1. Quite clearly, registers 1-4 include date information, registers 5-12 are meal quotas. None of these amount to information indicating that physical products have been pre-paid. The remaining registers, registers 0 and 13-14, contain administrative information. These registers likewise do not contain any “information indicating that a payment” for a specific meal has been made. Nor do any of these registers contain any “information indicating that” one or meals “have been pre-paid” as required by claim 1.

Nevertheless, the Office suggests that *Greer* discloses “receiving...information indicating that...physical products have been pre-paid” and “receiving...information indicating that a payment specific to...pre-paid physical products has been made” at col. 2, lines 25-30 and also at col. 3, lines 3-10.

The first cited passage, col. 2, lines 25-30, describes the existence of a meal plan payment system to be used at certain institutions. But this is not the claim limitation at issue. The fact that a meal plan exists, and that certain institutions use it does not amount to a disclosure of “receiving...information indicating that...physical products have been pre-paid.” Nor does it amount to a disclosure of “receiving...information indicating that a payment specific to...pre-paid physical products has been made.”

The second passage, at col. 3, lines 3-10, describes how a smart card is configured, and specifically, how the smart card is loaded with the data. This has nothing to do with the claim limitations.

The Examiner's position appears to be that, to the extent the meal plan may be prepaid, any meal that results from the meal plan is a "physical product" that is "pre-paid."

Applicant points out that the claim limitation requires that "payment specific to" certain physical products has been made. In *Greer*, to the extent the meal plan is paid for in advance, that pre-payment is not applicable to any specific meal. It is merely a right to receive a certain number of meals in particular time periods. In fact, one cannot even ascertain the average cost per meal until the term of the meal plan has expired.

***Greer* fails to teach "receiving, from the first terminal, a unique identifier that is used to identify a physical card"**

Greer does not describe any identifier that is used to identify a physical card.

The Office suggests a physical card identifier is disclosed at col. 2, lines 33-35, and again at col. 2, lines 39-41.

The text at lines 33-35 simply discloses the existence of a memory in the smart card. But this does not mean that the smart card has received, from a terminal, a unique identifier. Memory can have any data stored within it. One cannot infer, simply from the existence of memory, what the content of that memory might be.

In this case, it is not necessary to speculate as to the contents of the memory. *Greer* spells out, in great detail, the actual contents of the memory in connection with FIG. 1. It is apparent that the memory does not contain "a unique identifier that is used to identify a physical card."

Lines 39-41 explain that the plan code is a number that represents the food plan paid for by a customer. But this plan code identifies a food plan, not a physical card. The claim limitation requires receiving an identifier that identifies a card, not a food plan.

***Greer* fails to teach “adding...pre-paid physical products to an account associated with the physical card”**

Greer discloses adding information about a meal plan. The meal plan is not a physical product. The meal plan is simply a set of rules restricting how many meals a user can have and when the user may have them. In essence, the *Greer* smart card functions as a ticket for admission into a cafeteria.

The Office appears to suggest that just because a meal plan governs the dispensing of physical products, it is, itself, a physical product.

In fact, this is not the case. A plan for controlling the disposition of physical things is not in itself a physical thing. A meal plan has neither mass, shape, size, charge, or any other attribute of a physical object. A meal plan per se is an intangible abstraction, not a physical product.

***Greer* fails to disclose “storing the account information in a central database”**

The Office cites col. 2, lines 14-15 as allegedly disclosing the storage of “account information in a central database.”

The cited text describes FIG. 1. FIG. 1 certainly does show memory registers. But these registers are not in a central database. The registers in FIG. 1 are on the smart card itself. Hence, this cited text does not disclose “storing the account information in a central database.”

The Office further cites col. 2, lines 33-50 as allegedly disclosing the storage of “account information in a central database.”

The cited text describes registers. But these registers are not in any central database. They are on the smart card itself. Therefore, this text does not disclose “storing the account information in a central database.”

Finally, the Office cites col. 3, lines 1-17 as disclosing the storage of account information in a central database.

This last cited text describes how the card is configured. This involves writing data to the memory registers in the card. It says nothing about “storing the account information in a central database.”

***Greer* fails to teach “verifying...that the unique identifier received with the request matches the unique identifier used to identify the physical card, and that the pre-paid product in the request matches ...pre-paid products in the account”**

The Office cites four passages as allegedly disclosing

“verifying...that the unique identifier received with the request matches the unique identifier used to identify the physical card, and that the pre-paid product in the request matches ...pre-paid products in the account.”

The cited text at col. 2, lines 1-7 describes checking to see if the conditions are such that a cardholder is allowed to have a meal.

The cited text at col. 2, lines 50-55 describes where information about meal quotas is stored on the card.

The cited text at col. 1, lines 60-65 describes how a POS terminal determines whether a card is valid.

The cited text at col. 4, lines 22-32 describes an algorithm to determine whether a card holder is entitled to a meal.

None of the cited passages have any relevance whatsoever to the claim limitation of “verifying...that the unique identifier received with the request matches the unique identifier used to identify the physical card, and that the pre-paid product in the request matches ...pre-paid products in the account.”

D'Arbeloff fails to remedy the foregoing deficiencies in the teaching of *Greer*. Accordingly, the combination of *Greer* and *D'Arbeloff* would still fail to disclose the claimed invention.

Claims 41 and 44 include limitations similar to claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-25 and 46-50 all depend on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons described above in connection with claim 1.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 26

The Office draws attention to the POS terminal disclosed in *Greer*. However, that POS terminal in *Greer* is a stand-alone terminal. Accordingly, there is no communication with a central server. As a result, *Greer* cannot possibly disclose sending “messages to a central server to store information about...physical products in an account associated with a unique identifier of a physical card,” or receiving “messages from the central server indicating...pre-paid physical products in the account that are redeemable by a customer providing the unique identifier of the card.”

Claims 27-28 and 51-52 include the limitations of claim 26 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 3 AND 5

Claim 3 recites the additional limitation that the products include “a product associated with a specific stock keeping unit.” Claim 5 requires that a product be “associated with a family of SKU items.”

The Office concedes that the additional limitations of claim 3 and claim 5 are not disclosed in the cited art. Nevertheless, the Office asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the cited art to include associate the meals with SKUs.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that SKUs are used to identify inventory in a warehouse, or in retail stores. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have found it customary to adopt techniques intended for managing inventory in warehouses to identify meals in a food service facility. Thus, one of ordinary skill in

the art would have had no plausible reason to modify associate meals in a food service facility with stock keeping units.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 10

Claim 10 recites the additional limitation of “sending to the second terminal a message showing the pre-paid products in the account.”

Greer discloses two “terminals:” a configuration terminal and a POS terminal. The configuration terminal writes initial data to the card at the time the card is issued. The POS terminal scans the card each time it is presented for a meal. Its function is to determine whether all conditions for providing a meal have been met. Neither the POS terminal nor the configuration terminal engages in “sending...a message” of any sort, let alone “a message showing the pre-paid products in the account.”

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12, 13, AND 14

Claim 12 recites the additional limitation of “adding...a pre-paid discount.” Claims 13 and 14 recite a similar limitation.

The Office concedes that this limitation is not disclosed by the cited combination of references. The Office’s position is that one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the food plan in *Greer* in order to “encourage continued support.”

One of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that *Greer* pertains to institutional meal plans. One of ordinary skill in the art would also have understood that the competitive advantage of an institutional meal plan arises from its convenience for those who live and work in the institution, and not because of some price advantage. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had no plausible basis for reducing institutional revenue by cutting prices when the competitive advantage of an institutional meal plan arises not from price but from convenience.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 18 AND 48

Claim 18 recites a limitation that relates to transmission of messages. As discussed in connection with claim 10, neither the POS terminal nor the configuration terminal in *Greer* transmits messages.

Claim 18 also recites the limitation of “performing, by the computer, a check-level reconciliation, and automatically removing any products that have been added to the check but had not actually been paid for.” Claim 48 recites a similar limitation.

According to the Office, *Greer* discloses the foregoing limitation at col. 4, lines 1-37

The cited text does not disclose or suggest anything about a check, let alone removing products from a check.

The bulk of the cited text discloses determining that conditions for dispensing a meal have been met. But this has nothing to do with “performing, by the computer, a check-level reconciliation, and automatically removing any products that have been added to the check but had not actually been paid for.”

The last paragraph of the cited text refers to updating quota information stored on the smart card. This amounts to recording the fact that a meal was dispensed. It has nothing to do with “performing, by the computer, a check-level reconciliation, and automatically removing any products that have been added to the check but had not actually been paid for.”

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 19

Claim 19 recites the additional limitation that the first terminal in claim 1 be a POS terminal.

Greer discloses POS terminals. But these POS terminals simply determine whether the conditions for dispensing a meal to the cardholder have been met. They do

not send any of the information described in the first three paragraphs in claim 1, or in the sixth paragraph of claim 1.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 20

Claim 20 recites the additional limitation that the first terminal be a remote network terminal.

The Office cites two passages as allegedly disclosing a first terminal as recited in claim 20: col. 1, lines 49-53 and col. 3, lines 20-25. These passages appear to contradict each other. The first passage says the POS terminal is linked to a computer running an administrative software package, and the second says that the POS terminal is not linked to such a computer.

In either case, there is no indication that the POS terminal is a remote network terminal. One of ordinary skill in the art reading the specification would have understood that, to the extent the POS terminal is linked to a computer running an administrative software package, it is linked by a bus or other non-network connection. This interpretation is consistent with *Greer*'s description of the POS terminal as being an autonomous device.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 21

Claim 21 recites the additional limitation that the first terminal be a kiosk.

The Office cites two passages as allegedly disclosing a kiosk: col. 1, lines 49-53 and col. 3, lines 20-25. Both passages describe the existence of a POS terminal. But there is nothing that suggests that the POS terminal comprises a kiosk.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIMS 24-25

Claims 24 and 25 recite the further limitation that the “unique identifier that is used to identify a physical card” be one that identifies either a payment card or a smart card.

The Office concedes that *Greer* fails to disclose this limitation, but that it can be found in *D'Arbeloff*.

The cited text from *D'Arbeloff* discloses identifying a person, not a physical card. Accordingly, this is not the same as nor suggestive of the limitation, which requires an identifier that identifies “a physical card.”

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIMS 46-47

Both claims 46 and 47 require “transferring money from a first legal entity that owns the first terminal to a second legal entity that owns the second terminal,” with the distinction between the claims arising from the circumstances of the transfer.

The Office alleges that this claim limitation is disclosed in *Greer*’s abstract and also at col. 3, lines 3-10 of *Greer*. But neither of these passages addresses ownership of different terminals. Accordingly, *Greer* fails to disclose or suggest at least this limitation of claims 48 and 49.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 49

Claim 49 recites limitations on two different POS terminals. Specifically, the first terminal includes:

a first point-of-sale terminal having access to a first point-of-sale database having information about products that are available for purchase or redemption at the first point-of-sale terminal,

and the second terminal includes:

“a second point-of-sale terminal having access to a second point-of-sale database having information about products that are available for purchase or redemption at the second point-of-sale terminal,

Claim 49 further imposes restrictions on access to the POS databases. Specifically:

the first point-of-sale terminal does not have access to the second point-of-sale database, and the second point-of-sale terminal does not have access to the first point-of-sale database

The Offices alleges that these limitations are all disclosed either in the abstract or at col. 3, lines 3-10 of *Greer*. But neither of those passages ever refers to a POS as having its own associated database. Nor do those passages ever refer to a POS that cannot access a database of another POS. Thus, the cited passages have little relevance to the claim limitation.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 50

Claim 50 recites limitations on two different POS terminals. Specifically, the first terminal includes:

a first point-of-sale terminal having access to a first point-of-sale database having information about products that are available for purchase or redemption at the first point-of-sale terminal,

and the second terminal includes:

“a second point-of-sale terminal having access to a second point-of-sale database having information about products that are available for purchase or redemption at the second point-of-sale terminal,

Claim 50 further imposes restrictions on products available at each POS. Specifically:

at least some of the products that are available for redemption at the second point-of-sale terminal are different from the products that are available for purchase at the first point-of-sale terminal

The Offices alleges that these limitations are all disclosed either in the abstract or at col. 3, lines 3-10 of *Greer*. But neither of those passages ever refers to a POS as having its own associated database. Nor do those passages ever refer to different products being available from different POS terminals. Thus, the cited passages have little relevance to the claim limitation.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 51

Claim 51 recites two different POS terminals in which the first POS terminal enables a customer to redeem a pre-paid product that was added to the customer's

account from a second POS terminal. This second POS terminal includes a corresponding POS database with information about products available at the second POS terminal.

The cited text (abstract and col. 3, lines 3-10) does not describe two POS terminals, with redemption at one terminal of a pre paid product added at another terminal. Instead, the cited text describes certain administrative steps associated with setting up smart cards, as well as details on the quota system used to restrict the card user's access to meals. This plainly has nothing to do with the claim limitation.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 52

Claim 52 requires two POS databases with non-overlapping content.

The cited text (abstract and col. 3, lines 3-10) does not describe POS databases, let alone whether or not their content overlaps. Hence, the cited text has nothing to do with the additional limitation of claim 52.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 45

The cited text refers to using a computer to configure a smart card.

Claim 45 requires that the request to add pre paid products to an account be sent from a POS terminal.

In *Greer*, the computer that configures a smart card and adds information about a meal plan is not a POS terminal. According to *Greer*, POS terminals read a smart card, and determine whether a meal can be dispensed. If a meal is to be dispensed, the POS terminal also updates a count so that the customer does not obtain more meals than he should. This does not amount to adding a pre-paid product to the smart card, but is in fact closer to its opposite.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 32

Claim 32 recites numerous limitations similar to those recited by claim 1. For those limitations, Applicant re-asserts the corresponding arguments made in connection with claim 1.

Claim 32 includes the further limitation of

“using a set of rules to verify that the second physical product is within the family of specific physical products represented by the first physical product.”

Toth discloses, in FIG. 2, buttons with labels for product families, such as “Beverages.” Clicking on one of these buttons leads to additional menus showing members of that family. For example, clicking on “Beverages” leads to the list of beverages in FIG. 3. Accordingly, *Toth* discloses that food items can be placed into categories.

The act of showing a list of products that belong to a particular category does not amount to “using a set of rules to verify” that one of those products is in the same category as another product.

For example, if a customer were to click “iced tea” in FIG. 3, *Toth*’s system would simply place an order for iced tea. There is no indication that *Toth*’s system would respond to such a click by executing rules for determining whether a second physical product, i.e., iced tea, and a first physical product, i.e. a hamburger, are in the same family. Nor is there any indication that either of the cited references would carry out anything remotely like such a function.

Accordingly, even if one were to somehow combine all three references with each other, the result would still fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

As for the proposed motivation to combine the references, the Office suggests it would have been obvious for one to modify the teaching of *Greer* and *D'Arbeloff* so as to “allow customers or students to select the components of their meal from a variety of options that may be classified as part of a larger classification such as different entrees, appetizers, or desserts.”

Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that there already exists something that would “allow customers or students to select the components of their meal from a variety of options that may be classified as part of a larger classification such as different entrees, appetizers, or desserts.” Such a device is better known as a “menu.”

Applicant is not claiming the fact that menus have various sections. Applicant’s claim recites

using a set of rules to verify that the second physical product is within the family of specific physical products represented by the first physical product.

The foregoing claim limitation is not the same thing as displaying a menu that shows desserts in a dessert category and appetizers in an appetizer category.

Claims 33-36 include the limitations of claim 32 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 6-8 include limitations that are allegedly disclosed by *Toth*. Those claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 36

Claim 36 requires that the set of rules be “specific to at least one of a user who requests to redeem a product, a store where the request to redeem a product originates, a merchant associated a product to be redeemed, or a time when a request to redeem a product is made.”

The Office states that *Toth* discloses this limitation at paragraph 74 and 22.

Paragraph 22 merely states that there exists a need for a system that guides the user through ordering and makes him feel as if the order has been properly entered and received. This has nothing to do with rules that are “specific to at least one of a user who requests to redeem a product, a store where the request to redeem a product originates, a

merchant associated a product to be redeemed, or a time when a request to redeem a product is made.”

Paragraph 74 simply describes FIGS. 2 and 3, which show two layers of a hierarchical menu. The existence of two hierarchical menu layers has nothing whatsoever to do with rules that are “specific to at least one of a user who requests to redeem a product, a store where the request to redeem a product originates, a merchant associated a product to be redeemed, or a time when a request to redeem a product is made.”

Claims 33-36 include the limitations of claim 32 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 32.

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIM 35

Claim 35 recites the additional limitation of having the request to redeem a second product originate “from a point of sale terminal at a restaurant.”

The Office asserts that *Toth* discloses this limitation at paragraph 74 and at paragraph 22.

Paragraph 22 merely states that there exists a need for a system that guides the user through ordering and makes him feel as if the order has been properly entered and received. This has nothing to do with having a request to redeem a second product originate “from a point of sale terminal at a restaurant.”

Paragraph 74 simply describes FIGS. 2 and 3, which show two layers of a hierarchical menu. The existence of two hierarchical menu layers has nothing whatsoever to do with having a request to redeem a second product originate “from a point of sale terminal at a restaurant.”

Toth discloses using a POS at a restaurant. But *Toth*’s POS is only being used to order food, not for redemption.

Applicant(s) : *Robbins, et al.*
Serial No. : 10/766,517
Filed : January 28, 2004
Page : 16 of 17

Attorney Docket No.: 30074-002001

SECTION 103 REJECTION OF CLAIMS 53-56, and 37-40

Limitations of these claims have all been discussed above. Accordingly, these claims are all patentable for reasons already discussed above.

DECLARATION UNDER RULE 1.131

D'Arbeloff appears to be available as prior art under 35 USC 102(a) because it was published on January 9, 2003, which is before Applicant's priority date of January 28, 2003. However, as indicated by the enclosed declaration under Rule 131 and supporting documentation, prior to January 9, 2003, Applicant had already made the invention. Accordingly, *D'Arbeloff* is not in fact properly prior art under 35 USC 102(a).

D'Arbeloff is also available as prior art under 35 USC 102(e). However, both the present invention and *D'Arbeloff* were assigned to or obligated to be assigned to Paytronix, Inc.

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Pursuant to Rule 1.136, Applicant requests that the response period be extended up to and including March 9, 2010. Please charge the extension fee to our deposit account identified below.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The Petition for Extension of Time fee in the amount of 65.00 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. No other fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this

Applicant(s) : *Robbins, et al.*
Serial No. : 10/766,517
Filed : January 28, 2004
Page : 17 of 17

Attorney Docket No.: 30074-002001

response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our Deposit Account No. 50-4189, referencing Attorney Docket No. 30074-002001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 10, 2010


Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Customer No. 69713
Occhiuti Rohlicek & Tsao LLP
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Telephone: (617) 500-2533
Facsimile: (617) 500-2499
132228.doc

EXHIBIT A

Products on Gift Cards

Feature Design Document

Feature:	Products on Gift Cards
Written by:	Artan Simeqi
Date:	■■■■■■■■■■

1. Introduction

One of the features that our product has gives the merchant the ability to sell a gift card with any amount of money in it.

The new feature that we are proposing would give the merchant the ability to sell a gift card with any amount of different rewards on it.

2. Revision History

Version	Date	Who	Description
1.0	■■■■■■■■■■	A. Simeqi	Initial version

3. Features Summary :

The merchant will be able to issue a card with say: 2 Appetizers, 1 Entrée, 2 drinks etc.

These will be particular menu items, set up in the Micros database for this purpose and grouped in a family group or a major group.

For each of these items, there will be a button that adds them to the card. The customer pays for the items and gets the card with all the rewards. The card is rechargeable, i.e. rewards can be added to it at any time.

If we won't be able to have many buttons, we can have one button which will ask for the product to be added and add it to the card.

We would like to post the payment for the card as a non-revenue service charge. However it is not clear if we would be able to do that since in one check only one non-revenue service charge posting is allowed. Another limitation is related to the way we implement the rewards. See below in design decisions for a more complete discussion of the problem.

4. Design Decisions

To realize this feature we will need to make changes on the Database, PXS and POS code.

The Database and PXS part consists on setting up the card template and the wallets for the rewards on the database and exposing them through the Rule Engine on the PXS.

The communication from the POS to PXS will be through an AddRedeem message. No changes will be made to the communication protocol.

It seems that there are two major directions in which we can work. Right now it is not clear which one is better.

One method would be to have one button for each reward that can be added to the class. Each time a button is clicked, an item is inserted to the check. No calls to ISL are involved. At the end the server clicks another button which calls an inquiry in our code. It asks the server to swipe the card and then goes through the checks to find all the items that should be placed on the card as rewards. It knows what items to select through information stored in the loadmap. Then it sends an AddRedeem request with the list of all the rewards. The PXS gets the list, if the card is not activated activates it, adds the rewards to their wallets and sends the reply to POS. Our code inserts a line item on the check and sends a Sync to PXS.

Related to the activation, if we don't want to implement it directly on the PXS, we could first make a balance inquiry on it and if the card is not active, send an Activate message first.

The second method is to have only one button which, when clicked, calls a SIM inquiry which presents the server with a list of rewards to choose from. The list will be presented to the server

until he clicks "Clear", at which point the code, which has kept the list of choices from the server, asks to swipe a card. When the card is swiped, the code communicates with PXS as above and only then inserts the rewards on the check.

The second method is not very likable because the server is used to click buttons and not selecting choices from a list. But we are sure that all the rewards are inserted into the card. Using the first method, if the server forgets to swipe the card at the end, there seems to be no obvious way to remind him to do so.

The first method looks better but has the "forgetting to swipe the card" problem. We can try to remedy for that in several ways. One way would be to put all the buttons with the rewards in a separate screen. The only way to come out of this screen is to click a button which calls our SIM inquiry. The SIM inquiry asks the server to swipe a card. If a card is not swiped, the code doesn't allow the server to change the screen. We have to investigate how this can be done using ISL code.

Also at the end we can add a processExceptions method, which prints a warning receipt if it sees rewards on check that haven't been added to a card.

The second method gives us a possibility which seems important at first look. If, instead of inserting the rewards on the check, we calculate their value and insert that value on check, we can achieve one objective which is to post the payment as a non-revenue service charge.

However, the way we implement the rewards right now, they are applied as discounts, so the rewards on a gift card would never be posted as revenue. One could propose instead to use the card as a special Stored Value Card which is used to make a payment. I am not sure how can this can be done, since there could be price differences between the reward and the real menu item.

One more item which needs consideration is how to void the rewards. If the items are on the check and we void them before adding them to the card, this would raise a problem for us, or at least wouldn't be a big problem (depending on the way one does the void). For the other cases we need more consideration. I think we will have to first decide which method to use to add the products on the card, then think about voids, cancels and such. But we need to do something in this department.

A possible third method which looked interesting at first was for the server to click a button "Sell product rewards card", and be prompted to swipe the card. After this he can add products one by one in the card, by clicking on the corresponding buttons. Unfortunately this doesn't seem possible to do for 8700 systems. The problem is that for each click of the button you have to call our code via some Event. If there was only one such event, then it would need to have arguments to specify which button called it. I don't know at this moment how to do that, but I will continue my research since this can be a very interesting feature. If, on the other side, we have one event for each button, and if, as it seems reasonable, those events are inquiry events, that we would hit pretty fast the limit of only 20 available inquiry events for one PMS interface on the 8700.



5. Testing Considerations

This feature will need to be tested completely.

Testing would include the ability to sell a card with a bunch of rewards on it, the ability to add rewards later, and the ability to redeem those rewards.

EXHIBIT B

